

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

ANNA K. NUPSON <i>Plaintiff</i>	:	CIVIL ACTION
	:	
	:	
v.	:	NO. 18-2505
	:	
	:	
SCHNADER HARRISON SEGAL & LEWIS LLP, <i>et al.</i>	:	
	:	
<i>Defendants</i>	:	

ORDER

AND NOW, this 6th day of September 2022, upon consideration of Defendants' *motion to strike Plaintiff's motion for sanctions*, [ECF 259], and Plaintiff's response in opposition thereto, [ECF 263], it is hereby **ORDERED** that the motion to strike is **DENIED**.¹ Accordingly, consistent with the Order of February 22, 2022, [ECF 262], Defendants shall file a response to Plaintiff's motion for sanctions, [ECF 254], by September 20, 2022.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Nitza I. Quiñones Alejandro
NITZA I. QUIÑONES ALEJANDRO
Judge, United States District Court

¹ In the instant motion, Defendants argue that Plaintiff's previously-filed motion for sanctions, [ECF 254], was filed in violation of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(b)(5)(B) and the parties' stipulated protective order. In support, Defendants contend that Plaintiff failed to satisfy various meet-and-confer requirements and inappropriately made public inadvertently disclosed documents. Defendants' contentions are misplaced. Plaintiff filed the inadvertently disclosed documents under seal and engaged in an adequate meet-and-confer process before filing its motion for sanctions. As such, Defendants' motion is denied.